

THE  
PAMPHLET  
ENTITLED,  
Speculum Ecclesiasticum,  
OR AN  
ECCLESIASTICAL PROSPECTIVE - GLASS,  
CONSIDERED,  
In its Falſe  
REASONINGS  
AND  
QUOTATIONS.

---

---

L O N D O N :

Printed for ~~Wm.~~ *Wm.* Chitwell, at the *Rose and Crown* in  
St. Paul's Church-Yard. MDC LXXXVIII.

---

# IMPRIMATUR,

Hic Liber cui Titulus, [ *The Speculum Ecclesiasticum, &c.*  
Considered, &c. ]

Oct. 24. 1687.

*Hen. Maurice* R<sup>mo</sup>. in Christo  
P. D. Wilhelmo Archiep.  
Cant. a Sacris.

---

---

THE  
PAMPHLET  
ENTITLED,  
SPECULUM ECCLESIASTICUM:  
OR, AN  
Ecclesiastical Prospective-Glass, &c.

**T**Here can be no greater Argument of a baffled and erroneous Cause, than when the Assertors of it are forced to maintain it with manifest Impostures. The Religion of the Church of *Rome* is in great measure owing to Legends and Forged Writings: With the first they deluded the vulgar; and with the second, circumvented the wiser part of mankind. The Usurpation of the See of *Rome* was never submitted to, nor its Primacy believed in the *West*, till the spurious Decretals of *Isidore Mercator* were universally received by a blind and ignorant Age, and believed to be the genuine Decrees of Ancient Popes. No sooner did Learning begin to flourish in the last Age, but these Phantasms disappeared, were decried, and disowned by all learned and ingenuous men. To produce them anew upon the stage, and urge the Authority of them in this learned

age, can be no other than the last efforts of a despairing and dying Cause, which wanteth both Reason and Truth to uphold it. To recur to these Forgeries, after the falseness and folly of them hath been detected and demonstrated by learned men of both Communions; is an invincible Argument, that the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* was at first founded on them, and cannot now be maintain'd without them.

It may justly be wondred, that men whose office and design it is to uphold the Cause of the Church of *Rome*, and perswade others of the truth of it, should make use of such artifices, as will infallibly, when discovered, make all sober men suspect her Cause of falseness, and accuse her Agents of dishonesty. Yet this hath been lately done by some Gentlemen of the Church of *Rome*, in a little Pamphlet, called *Speculum Ecclesiasticum*, or an *Ecclesiastical Prospective-Glass*; wherein all the Ancient Forgeries of the Church of *Rome* are reproduced, and alledged as undoubted Testimonies of Antiquity. An Imposture so gross and palpable, that if unadvisedly committed, the Ignorance of this Author must be deplorable; if voluntarily, his Fraud must be detestable. Such miserable delusions are unfitly calculated for our Age, and can serve for no other end, than for what they were at first invented, to amuse Children, and seduce weak people.

The Author divideth his *Prospective-Glass* into eight Parts or Columes; and in them undertaketh to prove the Doctrines of the Church of *Rome* from Scripture, and the Testimonies of the Fathers of the Church for the first 500 years. The proofs of Scripture I shall not consider, because they are either wholly impertinent, or have been often answered by the Writers of our Church; and upon the Testimonies of Antiquity, I will only make  
some



some few Observations: For so idle a Paper deserves not a strict and severe Answer.

The first **Column** of our Adversary treateth of the Churches continued Succession, and the tradition of all Christian Doctrines through all Ages of the Church. This might well have been spared, and concerns no more the Church of *Rome*, than it doth any other particular Church. In the Church of *England* we have a Succession of Bishops continued down from the Apostolick times to this day. The nomination or particular enumeration of them, is neither necessary nor useful. None will deny the Churches of *Ephesus*, *Smyrna*, and *Philadelphia*. to have enjoyed a continued Series of Bishops from the Apostles times; yet are the names of the far greater part of them unknown. Neither is the Succession of the Bishops of *Rome* certain and undoubted. The immediate Successors of *St. Peter* are at this day unknown. *Linus* most probably died before him. *Cletus* and *Anacletus* were most certainly the same person. In succeeding Ages many great and long Schisms happened, wherein two, and sometimes three Popes together pretended to the Papal Chair, whose right was so dubious and uncertain, that *Wernerus Rollinck* \* professeth, most learned and conscientious men could not discern to which party they ought to adhere. And at this day, the *French* and *Italian* Writers agree not in composing a Catalogue of Popes; the first placing divers among the Popes, which the second reject as Antipopes. No other eminent See of the Catholick Church hath suffered these divisions: So that the Succession of the Bishops of *Rome* is more doubtful and uncertain than any other Succession of Bishops in the World. *St. Irenæus* indeed, *St. Augustin*, and *Optatus*, alledged by this Writer, disputing against the Hereticks, object to them that they are upstarts,

\* Fascic.  
Temp.

starts, men of yesterday, who could not deduce their Succession from the Apostles; whereas their Catholicks had a visible Succession of Bishops presiding in their Churches from the Apostles times: and to prove this, produce the Succession of *Roman* Bishops, not as of so many Heads of the Universal Church, but as of the Bishops of the most eminent See of the Western Church. For the force of their Argument lay not in the particular Succession of the *Roman* Bishops, but in the several Successions of all the Catholick Bishops of the Universal Church; of which they produced that of *Rome* as an example. This appears plainly from the words of *Irenaeus*, who prefixeth this Preface to his Catalogue of *Roman* Bishops: *Seeing it is too much to reckon up the Succession of all Churches, I will instance only in that of Rome*: As for Succession of Doctrine, we may with far greater justice claim that, than do our Adversaries. For the Church of *England* admitteth, receiveth, and believeth all Doctrines which have been universally taught and delivered down by all Churches in all Ages; and proposeth none to her Children as necessary to be believed, which have not that universal testimony: Whereas the Church of *Rome* commandeth several Doctrines to be believed upon pain of *Anathema*, which were unknown to Antiquity, and are at this day denied by the greater part of Christians.

The Fourth Column of the Unity of the Church, is of the same stamp. We, no less firmly, than our Adversaries, believe the *Catholick Church* to be one: We willingly allow that there is no hope of Salvation out of the Pale of that Church, and have always asserted Schism to be a damnable sin. But that the particular Church of *Rome*, or in Communion with the See of *Rome*, is that Universal Church; that a small and corrupt member

ber of it is the whole; and that all Churches not Communicating with the Bishop of *Rome*, are Schismatical; this we neither believe, nor can our Adversaries prove: Certainly all the testimonies here alledged insinuate no such thing. But if Schism be so great a sin, if wilful and unnecessary Separation from any part of the Catholick Church be damnable; What shall we say of those persons, whose office and employment it is to promote and foment this Schism, and draw the Members of the Church of *England* into an unlawful separation from her? To accuse the Church of *England* of Schism or Separation from the *Papists*, is to go contrary to sense and reason: For 'tis notorious to the whole World, that all the Subjects of *England* communicated with our Church till the 10th year of Queen *Elizabeth*; when upon the Pope's prohibition, a small party flew off into separate Assemblies, who have since continued their separate Meetings under the name of *Roman Catholics*. And shall the Church of *England* be said to have separated from those men? This cannot be said with any colour of Truth. That Papal prohibition began the Schism, which till then had no existence. For the Church of *England* never did by any judicial act forbid her Children to Communicate with the Catholick Churches beyond Sea; nor require of her Communicants the belief of any point denied by them, or disbelief of any point maintained by them.

The third *Column*, of the Churches Infallibility, is of the same nature, and equal impertinence. We believe there ever was since the time of Christ, and shall be to the end of the World, a Church, or collection of men, believing all things necessary to Salvation. But that this Church is no other than the particular Church of *Rome*; and that to the belief of all necessary Articles, some false.

Perfidia.

Epist. ad E-  
phes.

false and erroneous Opinions never was, nor shall be intermixed; we do not believe, and it never can be proved. Now all the Testimonies alledged by our Author amounts to no more than this, That the Church of Christ is indefectible, ever did and always shall exist. That the whole Faith of Christ is always taught and preserved in it; and that in her Bosom Salvation may ever be found and obtained; But all this doth no more concern The Church of *Rome*, than it doth the Church of *England*. Our Author indeed alledgeth Three passages, wherein the Church of *Rome* is particularly mentioned: The first is a Complement of St. *Cyprian's* to Pope *Cornelius*, That to St. *Peter's* Chair Infidelity cannot have access. This hath been oftentimes answered by our Divines, and is indeed a meer Compliment, or at most, a declaration of his expectations groundd upon the prospect of a Learned and Orthodox Clergy, which then presided in the See of *Rome*. Besides infinite places of the Ancients might be produced, wherein they bestow no less Encomiums upon particular Churches, which by the confession of our Adversaries not only may, but have actually fallen from the Faith. Thus St. *Ignatius* saith, the Church of *Ephesus* was predestinated before all Ages, to continue for ever in a permanent and unchangeable glory. An expression which infinitely surpasseth St. *Cyprian's* Compliment. The Second passage is taken from *Victor Vitenfis*, whom our Author ignorantly calls *Vitensis*, where *Eugenius* Bishop of *Carthage* being urged by the *Arian* Tyrant *Hunmericus* to give an account of his Faith, desired leave to send to all his Fellow Bishops in the whole Catholick Church that they might meet in a General Council, particularly to the Bishop of *Rome*, who was the most eminent Bishop of the Western Church and first Patriarch of the World. For no General Council

cil could be held without the presence of all the Patriarchs either by themselves, or by their Legates. That *Eugenius* desired not the presence or advice of the Pope for any belief of his Infallibility, is manifest from what *Victor* \* immediately subjoins, that *Eugenius* said this, not because there were wanting men in *Africa*, who were able to refute the objections of the *Arians*, and vindicate the Catholick Cause: But that such Bishops might be drawn into *Africa*, as feared not the threats and violence of *Hunmericus*, being none of his natural Subjects. The third is a passage of *St. Cyril of Hierusalem* in his Apology against *Rufinus*, that the Roman Faith, commended by the Apostles, cannot be changed. Of this Apology I shall speak somewhat hereafter: To the words alledged, I need only say, our Adversaries can never prove that unchangeable Faith, which the Apostle commended, to be the Faith of the present Church of Rome.

\* De Persecut.  
Vandal. l. 2.

Thus have we proved three of our Authors eight Columns to be wholly trifling and impertinent; I will next observe his ignorance and mistakes of Chronology. *St. Cyprian* is by him placed before *Origen*; when as the latter was a famous Writer of the Church long before the first was converted to the Faith. *Gregory Nyssen* and *St. Hierom* are ranked before *Athanasius*; who was a Bishop before either of the other were born. *Tertullian* before *Theophilus Antiochenus*, who was a Bishop near Twenty five years before the other was made Priest. *Victor Vitenfis* placed in the beginning of the 4th Age, who lived in the end of the 5th. But our honest Author, because he writ of a Persecution, thought he must necessarily mean an Heathen Persecution, and therefore set him before *Lactantius*. In the same manner he placeth *St. Cyril of Alexandria* before *St. Chrysostom*, and *St.*

*Ambrose* before *St. Athanasius*. But Chronology is not the business of our Author. Let us next view his Criticism: where we shall find all the Fables and Forgeries of Ancient and latter times adapted and produced by him.

I begin with the Decretals of the Ancient Popes; out of which he cites the Epistles of *St. Clemens*, *Anacletus*, and *Pius*. It were superfluous to resume an Argument so often cleared, and to prove these Epistles to be spurious, if we had not to deal with a generation of men, whose either ignorance or effrontery requireth it. This hath been often confessed, and at large demonstrated by Learned Writers of the Church of *Rome*, but more fully by the Reformed Divines: Inasmuch that it is long since become a received and undoubted opinion among all the learned men of both Communions. And indeed the thing is manifest beyond all contradiction; For no Pope, Father, or Writer, before the 9th Age ever made mention of them. The Vulgar Version of the Bible is constantly used in them, which was not composed till the beginning of the fifth Age. They are almost wholly made up of an infinite number of passages stoln from the Writings, Canons and Constitutions of Authors, Councils, Popes and Emperors, who lived between the Third and the Ninth Age. They are neither adapted to the genius, nor necessities of those times: Frequently they oppose Heresies, which began not till the 4th Age. Are full of ridiculous Anachronisms, barbarous Phrases, and foolish Solecisms, which those first and purer Ages could not be guilty of. Lastly, they mention many points of Discipline and Ecclesiastical Terms, which were unknown to the three first Ages, and not introduced till some Ages after. Not only the falsity of these *Decretals* is apparent and confessed; but their Author and Age



age can be assigned. They were first published to the World by *Riculpbus Bishop of Mentz*, who received them from *Isidore Mercator* in the beginning of the *Ninth Age*. *Bellarmin*, *Baronius*, *Perron*, and *Petavius* acknowledg them to be dubious, and dare not defend them. But latter Criticks of the Church of *Rome* openly confess them to be spurious. Thus *Labbe* and *Cossart* in their Collection of Councils, affix a note of falsity to every one of them: And particularly give this Censure of most of them: That they are esteemed suppositions by learned Catholics. *Baluzius* † gives an account of their Original, progress and reception in the *Gallican Church*: And *Du Pin* affirmeth, They are rejected with a common consent.

† A prefat.  
ad Reginon.

The spurious Writings of *Dionysius the Areopagite*, come next to be considered: Which forgery our Author so fully believeth, that he ever placeth them immediately after the Holy Scriptures. That they belong not to the *Areopagite* is manifest from the universal silence of the ancients, till the *Sixth Age*: The subtile argumentation and elaborate stile of them far different from the simplicity of the Apostolick times. They were writ in the flourishing estate of the Church; and therefore make no mention of Martyrs or Persecutions; but rather frequently oppose the Heresie of *Arius*. The Author of them cites the *Apocalypse* of *St. John*, and *Ignatius* his Epistles, particularly that to the *Romans*, written just before his Martyrdom in the year 107. long after the *Areopagites* death. I might add, that he mentions many Ceremonies not introduced into the Church till the *Fourth Age*; speaks of the Order of *Monsks*, and cites *St. Clement* of *Alexandria*. But I need not insist any longer upon a thing so evident. The falsity of these Writings is confessed, and demonstrated

by *Petavius*, *Morinus*, *Launoy*, *Oudin*, *Du Pin*, and many other learned Authors of the Church of *Rome*.

The Commentaries of *Theophilus Bishop of Antioch* upon the Gospels, are most certainly the product of a *Latin Writer*, and therefore spurious. Such Commentaries were indeed anciently extant under *Theophilus* his name; but were rejected by *St. Hierom* <sup>(a)</sup> as supposititious. As for those we now have, they were forged after *St. Cyprian's* time. For the Author transcribes a passage out of *Cyprian's* sixth Epistle to *Magnus*. Upon which account, *Labbe* and *Du Pin* do esteem this Work to be spurious. The Oration of *St. Hippolitus* the *Consummation of the World*, is of the same stamp, as appears from the barbarous stile, childish expressions, and foolish Fables, which may be found in it. For which reasons *Du Pin* saith, It is very uncertain, and may be justly call'd in question.

But to what miserable shifts is our Author reduced, when he citeth the Epistle of *St. Athanasius* to *Pope Felix*; an Epistle forged by *Isidore Mercator*, together with the *Decretals*, and almost wholly patch't up out of the Acts of the *Lateran Council* under *Pope Martin*, in the year 649: And wherein *Athanasius* tells *Felix*; that he had been ordained Bishop at *Rome* by his sacred hands; whereas the true *Athanasius* was ordained at *Alexandria* more than Forty years before *Felix* was made Pope. *Binius* acknowledgeth it to be spurious, and *Labbe* <sup>(b)</sup> gives this scornful censure of it '*Ad malas Mercatoris merces has ineptæ farraginis quisquiliæ*. ' *Baronius*, '*aliique eruditi viri ablegant*; which I will not translate, lest I should be thought to rail, instead of confuting.

However, to alledge a spurious Writing, may be only a matter of artifice to impose upon an unwary Reader: But to cite the undoubted Work of one Author, under the

(a) De Script.  
Ecl. cap. 25.

(b) Concil.  
Tom. II. p. 844.



the name of another, to whom it was never before attributed, can be no other than gross ignorance. Our Author citeth St. *Hierom's* Third Apology against *Ruffinus* under the name of St. *Cyrl* of *Hierusalem*, who was dead many years before the name of *Ruffinus* was known, or this Apology written. Whether this was a matter of design, that the Reader might never be able to consult the place, our Author can best tell. Certainly the passage is infinitely trifling and impertinent. For St. *Hierom* accusing *Ruffinus* of a forgery in publishing at *Rome* an Apology for *Origen*, under the name of *Pamphilus* the *Martyr*, tells him he had mist of his design; For the *Romans* did not believe it to be the Work of that *Martyr*: And then adds, that the *Roman* Faith, commended by the Apostle, could not be imposed upon by such tricks. This is a piece of flattery, which even no sober *Papist* will allow to be strictly true. For all grant that the whole Church may be deceived in judging a matter of fact; such is, whether this or that Author writ such a Treatise. And the Church of *Rome* hath been actually deluded by many Impostures of this nature, as the Spurious *Decretals* of *Isidore Mercator*, which she received and used as genuine for many Ages. But not to depart from this very instance, St. *Hierom* hath sufficiently refuted his own words by imposing upon the *Romans*, in perswading them that this Apology, translated and published by *Ruffinus*, was not the work of *Pamphilus*, but of *Eusebius*. For it truly belonged to the former. *Eusebius* indeed added Five Books to it. But those were not translated by *Ruffinus*.

That the Book *de Cæna Domini* should in this Age be cited under the name of *Cyprian*, may be justly admired; when it is not only confessed by all to be spurious, but the true Author of it is known, *Arnoldus* Abbot

bot of *Bonvalle* in *France*, in the Twelfth Age. To him do *Raynaudus*, *Labbe*, *Oudin*, *Du Pin*, and almost all Manuscript Copies ascribe it.

*St. Ambrose's* Work of the *Sacraments* hath been call'd in question by many great and learned men of the Reformed Churches. If it should be allowed in the main to belong to *St. Ambrose*; they must, however, grant that it hath been miserably interpolated and corrupted by latter hands. For *Bertram* citeth several places out of it, which cannot now be found in it. But if this be dubious, it is most certain that the Sermons of *St. Ambrose* are spurious: Being no other than a Collection of the Sermons of several Authors, some more, others less ancient. This *Bellarmin* and *Labbe* acknowledg. Many of them may be found among the Sermons of *Maximus Taurinensis*, and particularly that of *St. Peter and Paul*, cited by our Author. The books *de Pœnitentia*, *Petrus Soto* (a) maintains to be spurious; and some learned men have subscribed to his Opinion. In like manner *Erasmus* contends that the Homilies of *Origen* upon the *Psalms* are spurious, and *Bellarmin* placeth them among the dubious Writings. But in these Two last Cases, nothing certain can be determined.

(a) Institut.  
Sacerd. tit. de  
necess. Confes.  
Lect. 2.

The books *de Visitatione Infirmorum*, cited by our Author, under the name of *St. Augustin*, *Bellarmin* and *Labbe* confess to be spurious. That they are so, need no other argument than the foolish arguments and barbarous stile of them, unworthy of the judgment and learning of *St. Augustin*. *Erasmus* giveth this Censure of them, *The work of a prating Fellow, who had neither Wit nor Learning. What shame or reason have those persons left, who obtrude such Writings to us under the name of Augustin?* Our Author refers us to the Second book

of this Treatise for a proof of Sacerdotal confession. There indeed we may find this Confession commended, advised and enjoyned (which is also done by the Church of *England*) but in the mean while the necessity of it disowned, and the sufficiency of a private confession to God acknowledged. For the Author blaming some persons who dehorted men from Sacerdotal confession, saith, Let not the superstition of these Dreamers seduce you, which confirmeth sinners in their resolutions of not confessing to a Priest, *Quia salvat Sacerdote inconsulto ad Deum peccatorum confessio: Because confession of sins to God without consulting any Priest, is sufficient to Salvation:* Where he plainly allows the truth of this proposition, but blames the ill application of it. But because our Author refers us to this spurious Treatise; I would desire him to turn one Page farther, where he will find the Doctrine of doing any Penance after Death, and consequently of Purgatory, called a detestable blindness of heart, and occasion of the destruction of Souls.

O exterminanda cordis  
cæcatio. O  
perditionis  
animarum oc-  
casio. l. 2. c. 8.

The *Quæstiones ad Græcos*, cited by our Author under the name of *St. Justin Martyr*, are on all sides confessed to be supposititious, particularly by *Bellarmin*, *Labbe*; and *Du Pin*. The justice of this Censure is evidently evinced from the frequent mention therein, made of the *Manichees*, who were not heard of till more than a Hundred years after *Justin's* death. The Lamentation of *Origen* is the trifling product of some foolish *Latin* Writer; and therefore justly rejected as spurious by *Bellarmin*, *Baronius*, (a) *Labbe*, *Huetius*, (a) *Ad an. 252.* and *Du Pin*. I might add, that it was formerly condemned by Pope *Gelasus*, if his Decretal were not equally spurious. However, that excuseth not our Author; since that Decretal is universally received by all the Writers of the Church of *Rome*.

(a) Hist. Eccl.  
1. 7. c. 2.

Our Author citeth, *Two-Fragments of Eusebius Alexandrinus* out of *Jodocus Coccius*. But we have great reason to believe, that they are not genuine. For *Eusebius Caesariensis* (a) in mentioning *Eusebius Alexandrinus*, speaks not one word of his Writings; which that accurate Historian would by no means have omitted, if there had been any known in his time. No one of the Ancients make the least mention of such a Writer: Nor was he ever heard of till *Coccius* and *Turraïn* produced some fragments out of his Homilies. As for *Coccius*, he had not skill enough in this kind to pass a critical judgment upon the Writings of the ancients: and *Turraïn* cannot be securely trusted. For all the World knows with how great violence he maintained the Apostolick Canons and Constitutions to be genuine: A position which none but fools and mad men can believe.

(b) Hist. Con.  
Nic. 1. 2. c. 30.

The *Arabick Canons* of the first Council of *Nice*, are a no less foolish than evident forgery of latter times. All the *Greek* and *Latin* Copies give us no more than XX. Canons of that Council. *Gelasius Cyzicenus* saith (b) no more were made. The *African* Bishops sending into the East for true and correct Copies of them, receive from *Atticus* of *Constantinople*, and *Cyril* of *Alexandria* no more than XX. and these LXXX. *Arabick* Canons were never heard of till brought out of the East in the last Age by the Legates sent by *Pius IV.* to the Patriarch of *Alexandria* to invite him to the Council of *Trent*. But I need not use many arguments. They sufficiently betray themselves by the frequent mention of Names, Rites, and Customs which obtained not in the Church till after the Council of *Nice*. I will instance only in their several Constitutions, about Monasteries, Monks and Nuns, as that they be shaved, and use a distinct habit

bit from the rest of mankind; customs which were not known till some Ages after. And that we may not seem singular in making this Censure, the Learned *Abraham Echellenfis* (c) confesseth, That many of them were forged, others changed, and all accommodated by the several Sects of the *East* to their several Ages and Perswasions.

(c) Prefat. ad  
Version.

The sincerity of our Author deserveth next to be considered, which I fear would be found very small if I had time and leisure to compare all his Citations with the Originals. Those few which I have compared, give me a just suspicion of his fraudulent dealing in the rest, and may reasonably create the same prejudice in all his Readers. I will produce a few Instances. In the Fifth Column he citeth these words of *Irenæus* (a), *How can they be assured the Bread is made the Body of our Lord?* (d) L. 4. c. 37. In the Original it is *esse Corpus suum*, where he hath Translated *esse* to be *made*. A few lines after he produceth a passage of *Tertullian*, which no man in his right wits could ever have alledged for Transubstantiation: For the intire sentence is one of the most pregnant Testimonies of all Antiquity, against that monstrous opinion; the words are these (e), *The Bread taken and distributed to his Disciples, he made his Body, by saying, This is my Body, that is, the Figure of my Body*. Our Author hath cut off the latter part, and given us only the first words of this Passage. What name ought justly to be given to this Artifice, let others judg; but certainly none can call it sincerity. The corruption of *Justin Martyr* in the 7th Column is no less gross and evident; where our Author citeth these words out of his Second Apology: *We worship them* ( the good Angels ) *both by words and deeds, even as we our selves have been taught and instructed*. The Greek words are these, λόγῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ πωνοῦντες, καὶ ποιοῦντες εὐλογοῦντες καὶ ὑμνοῦντες, ἀρδέντως διδάσκοντες; *honouring them both in word and deed; and freely teaching every*

(e) Adv. Mar-  
cion l. 4. c. 40.

one who desireth to learn those things wherein we been instructed. A little before, he had cited *Dionysius* the *Areopagite*, for Prayers to the departed Saints, where he wilfully mistakes that Writers meaning; and what the Counterfeit *Dionysius* speaks of the Prayers of our pious Fellow-Christians here on Earth, applieth to Prayers made to departed Saints; and not only so, but falsifieth his words in more than one place; the passage is this \*;

\* De Ecclesiast.  
Hierarch. c. 7.

ἡρώδης πάντες εἰσὶν ἐν τῷ θῷ τῷ βίῳ ἡς ἀγίων αἱ προσευχαὶ καὶ τὸν διὰ τὸν, εἰ τις ἱερῶν ἡρώδης ὁ δούλων, — ἐλθὼν ἐπὶ τίνα ἡς ὁσίων ἀνδρῶν ἀξιώσειεν αὐτὸν διὰ ἡνέδει συλλήψεσθαι καὶ σωματικῶς, ἀφελιδίῃ. πάντες ἐν τούτοις. This I affirm consonantly to the Scripture; That the prayers of holy men are very useful in this life, this way. If any one desiring the Divine Graces, and be well disposed for the reception of them, shall (as being conscious of his own unworthiness) come to some holy man, and desire him to assist him, and pray together with him, he shall receive hence the greatest benefit. The words thus justly Translated, do neither favour nor relate to Prayers to the Dead. In the same Column he hath produced some words of *St. Chrysostom* \*, with no more ingenuity; for he translates *προσευχῶν αὐταῖς*, *Let us pray to them*; indeed the word *ἀξιώμεν* follows, *Let us desire them*, (which yet our Author after his wonted manner exaggerates, *Let us heartily beseech them*): But that this was a meer rhetorical Flight, may be demonstrated beyond all doubt; for in the immediately foregoing sentence he speaks much greater things of their dead Reliques, and Repositories; to which yet even our Author will grant that Prayers are not in a strict and proper sense to be addressed: *In this Fire of Devotion*, saith he, *let us fall down to their Reliques*; *let us embrace their Repositories*; for even the Repositories of Martyrs have great Virtue, as the Bones of Martyrs have great Force. These Rhetorical Apostrophes are frequent to all Orators, and ought

\* Orat. de SS.  
Bernic. &  
Prosdoco.



not to be drawn into Dogmatical Propositions.

I return now to consider our Authors *Columns* separately. The Second is about the Primacy of the Pope, and consists of some Testimonies of the Fathers, which abating the spurious ones, insinuate no more than that *St. Peter* was Prince or First of the Apostles, the Foundation upon which the Church was built, and the Keeper of the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; all this we readily acknowledg: None ever denied a Primacy of Order to *St. Peter*; the Scripture assures us that the Apostles were all Foundations of the Church; and our Saviour committed the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven to them all: If any of these Testimonies seem to attribute somewhat greater and more eminent to *St. Peter*, we are to consider that Orators seldom contain themselves within the severe bounds of truth, when they set themselves to make an Encomium of any. The Ancients speak no less things of *St. Paul*, and attribute to him no less swelling Titles, as might easily be proved, if our intended brevity would permit it. I will produce only some passages of *St. Chrysostom* \*, who calls him *The*

*Tongue of the World, the Light of the Churches, the Foundation of Faith, the Pillar and Ground of Truth, the Vessel of Election, the Temple of God, the Mouth of Christ, the Harp of the Holy Ghost, the Doctor of the World, the Teacher of Divine Opinions, the Schoolmaster of the World, upon whom the eyes of the whole World were cast, and upon whom the care of all the Churches in the World depended; to whose Government God had committed the whole World, to whom the whole World was committed, and all the Churches under the Sun, who governed all the Churches, People, Nations and Cities of the Earth, to whom none can be equalled, who had the Primacy, greater than all others; to Michael was committed the Government of the Jews, but to Paul, the Earth, the Sea, both the habitable, and*

\*Hom.inRom.  
xvi. 3. in ter-  
ra mor.&Laz.  
inPaulum,&c.

Hom. ad eos  
qui scandali-  
zati sunt Hom.  
de elemos. &  
collat.

Τὰ ὅλη τῆ ἀ  
ἑστὶ τοῦ Παύ-  
λου.

*inhabitable World, the Illuminator of the World, the greatest of all Men, who alone possessed all the perfections of the other Patriarchs, Apostles, Saints and Martyrs, who is admired and honoured beyond all the other Apostles. None of*

\* Οὐδὲς ἐστὶν  
οὐ μὴ ζωνάων  
ἐστὶν ἰσθμὸς.

*them was greater than him, yea none was equal to him. I am confident no passages can be found in all Antiquity in favour of St. Peter, which can equal these produced out of one Author in favour of St. Paul. The most express passage which our Author alledgeth, is that of Tertullian†, where he is supposed to call the Pope Chief Pastor, Bishop of Bishops, and Blessed Pope. But alas! all these are Ironical Expressions, directed to, not the Pope, but the Bishop of Carthage, as hath been invincibly proved by*

† Lib. de Pudic.

\* Alix. Dissert.  
de Script.  
Tertul. p. 70.

*a Learned Man\*, now of our Church. The more express Testimonies which remain, are only the first and the last of this Column: The first our Author thought so considerable, that he chose against his usual custom to give it us in Latin: It is part of the Inscription of St. Ignatius's Epistle to the Romans, wherein he calls them the sanctified and illuminated Church, which presides in the Country of the Romans. These inscriptions of Epistles were according to the Custom of the Eastern Nations, filled with great and swelling Titles, of which unhappily this to the Romans was one of the most modest; for he bestows far greater Titles upon other Churches in some of his Epistles, and particularly calls the Church of the Philadelphians *raised to the utmost pitch of perfection*; as for the word illuminated, it is a Title which the Ancient Christians bestowed upon all Baptized Persons, whom they called *κατηχούμενοι* and *μετανοοῦντες*, as Baptism was commonly called *κατήχησις*. And then for presiding in the Countrey of the Romans, every particular Episcopal See presidereth in her own Diocess; and therefore Ignatius doth not say, which presidereth in the whole World, but *which presidereth in the Province of Rome.**



Rome: The last Testimony is taken from *Socrates* and *Sozomen* attesting that the Eastern Synods were not valid, unless confirmed by the Pope; that he had a peculiar Priviledge of restoring Bishops unjustly deposed, and that to him belonged the care of all the Churches. But first, neither of the Historians affirm, That the Pope had any such priviledge which was not common to the other Patriarchs. For it was the constant custom of the Ancient Church, that in all emergent occasions of the Church, the Patriarchs should interpose their judgments, as being more peculiarly obliged to it; by that eminent station which they held among other Bishops: Not that the judgment of every one was authoritative, or immediately put in execution (for their judgments were oft-times contrary) but they thereby only declared what they thought just and Canonical, which if it was not performed, they with the Bishops subject to them, used to deny communion to the other party. Besides, there was a particular reason in the case mentioned by these Historians. For *Atbanasius* being deposed by the *Arians*, both Catholicks and *Arians* had submitted the Arbitration of the whole cause to Pope *Julius*. As for the confirmation of Councils; no Council could be General, till approved by all the Patriarchs; & therefore if a Synod were held in the East, where in the *Roman* Patriarch was present, neither by himself, nor by his Legates; no wonder if the Decrees of it obliged not the Western Patriarchate, till confirmed by the Pope. For no more did the Western Synods oblige the Eastern Churches, till confirmed by the Eastern Patriarchs.

The *Fifth Column* treateth of *Transubstantiation*, where in most of the Testimonies produced by our Author, say no more than that the Eucharistical elements after Consecration are the Body and Blood of our Lord. This we also assert and believe; but then the question remaineth still, in what

(a) De initan-  
dis, cap. 9.

what sense they are the body and blood of Christ; of the remaining citations the most express are those of *Justin Martyr*, *St. Ambrose*, and *St. Augustin*. The first even in the words cited by our Author affirms, That our Flesh and Blood are nourished by the Eucharistical elements; and therefore could not believe Transubstantiation. The Second indeed saith (a) that a preternatural change is made in the elements after Consecration, and the Bread then becomes the Body of Christ, which was born of the *Virgin Mary*, was crucified and buried. But that he means his typical not natural body, is manifest from the beginning of this Chapter, where he compares this heavenly food to *Manna*, or the Bread of Angels; and prefers it because that is subject to corruption, if it be kept from day to day; but this is free from corruption, which whosoever religiously tastes, cannot suffer corruption. From which words, Three several Arguments of a typical sense may be formed. For first, as *Manna* was not truly, but typically the Bread of Angels: So neither is the consecrated Bread truly, but typically the Body of Christ. Secondly, The consecrated elements are as to the matter of them subject to corruption: And therefore *St. Ambrose* believed not the matter of them, but only what they represented, to be the body of Christ Thirdly, He affirms this incorruptible Body of Christ to be received only by the Religious communicant: Whereas if *Transubstantiation*, be true, it is equally received by the most Irreligious person. *St. Augustin* in the place (a) cited by our Author expressly denieth all natural presence. His words are these, *When our Lord Jesus Christ spoke of his Body, He said, Whosoever eateth not my flesh, and drinketh not my blood, shall not have eternal Life: For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. His Disciples, who followed him, were afraid, and scandalized at that speech, and not truly understanding it, thought that our Lord spoke somewhat harsh*

(a) Comm. in  
Psal. 33.

harsh, as if they were to eat that flesh, and drink that blood, which they saw. They could not bear this; as if they had said, How can this be? Error, ignorance and folly had possessed them: Where he goes on to shew that this aversion of the Apostles proceeded from a misapprehension of our Lord's meaning; as if he intended to give them his natural flesh and blood to eat: *Whereas our Lord knew what he meant; he spoke of Sacraments*, or a sacramental presence. This passage sufficiently explains the following Clause cited by our Author, unless we can suppose St. *Augustin* in this obscure sentence to have contradicted the Doctrine by him plainly delivered in the precedent Words.

Sacramenta  
prædicabat.

*The Sixth Column* concerns *Sacramental Confession*, Priestly Absolution and Penance; and in all respects is wholly impertinent; as may appear by these few considerations. First, Then the Church of *England* retaineth and adviseth to her Children Confession, Absolution and Penance; But then she maketh not the first absolutely necessary to Salvation; nor the Second a judicial, but only declaratory act; nor the Third properly satisfactory for sins: Nor do any of the Testimonies produced by our Author, prove these positions. Secondly, The Confession used in the ancient Church was not *Auricular*, but publick; not lodged in the breast of the Priest, but made before the whole Congregation. And when afterwards about the time of the *Decian* Persecution these confessions became so numerous, that the Church could not hear them all, a *Pœnitentiarius* was chosen out of the Presbyters to receive them, he did not keep them secret to himself, but only pass judgment which were fit to be made known to the whole Church, and to be performed in the publick Congregation, and which not. 3. Absolution of the Priest was not believed to be judicial or authoritative, and immediately to absolve before God, but only declaratory of the pro-

## *The Speculum consider'd.*

promises of pardon made by God to all penitent sinners, and to have no other necessary effect, than the restoring of the penitents to the peace of the Church. This may be proved by that very passage of *St. Hierom*, which our Author citeth, where he compareth the Priestly absolution, to the cleansing of Lepers by the Priests under the old Law; a comparison very frequent with the Fathers. For as the *Jewish* Priests made not the Lepers clean, but only declared them so to be, and supposed them to be clean before their declaration; otherwise the declaration would not in the least have contributed to their cleansing: So a sacerdotal Absolution remits not the guilt of sins, but supposeth them to have been before remitted by God, and declareth so to be; otherwise the absolution of a Priest will avail the sinner nothing, nor set him right in the Court of Heaven. 4. Penance in the ancient Church was chiefly intended, not as a satisfaction to God for the violation of his Laws, but as a satisfaction to the Church, for the scandal given to others, and reproach drawn upon the whole Church by the former crimes or irregular practice of the penitents: And therefore was ever augmented or relaxed according to the various exigencies or necessities of times. 5. In the ancient Church, Penance ever preceded Absolution, and was the means of obtaining it: Whereas in the Church of *Rome*, the Penitent is first absolv'd, and then some subsequent Penance is imposed on him: Which takes away the very nature of Penance, Confession and Absolution, as they were used and designed the ancient Christians; and tends only to the interests of the Priest, and delusion of private souls.

The *Seventh Column* undertaketh to prove the lawfulness of *Invocation or Prayer to Saints*, and that they pray for us: the latter we need not deny; but maintain, that that will not warrant the former. So that when all the spurious Testimonies, those which we have

already answered, and those which prove only that the departed Saints pray for us, be expunged; there remain no more than one of *St. Ambrose* (for that of *St. Hierom* is a plain historical Apostrophe) and one of *Theodoret*. As for the first, I might justly oppose the authority of some learned men, who maintain this Book *de Viduis*, whence the passage is taken, to be supposititious. But I will content my self to say, That our Author hath falsely translated the place, by rendring *Obsecrandi sunt Angeli pro nobis, ut, &c.* *Obsecrandi sunt Martyres, We are to desire the assistance of the Angels; we are to pray to the Martyrs*: Whereas the words do not in the least insinuate an Exhortation of Prayer to be made to them by us; but only a wish, that they would pray for us, and that we should gratefully accept their charitable kindness in so doing. The Passage of *Theodoret*, as cited by our Author, is a plain forgery. For *Theodoret* speaks not one Syllable of praying to the Martyrs; and what our Author translates, *beseech them as Holy men to intercede to God for them*, is no more in the Greek than this, *ὡς ἁγίους αὐτοὺς τιμῶμεν καὶ σεβασμὸν αὐτοῖς ἀποδίδωμεν, We honour, or reverence them as holy men.*

|| De curand.  
affect. Græc.  
Orat. 8.

The last Column treateth of *Purgatory*, and Prayer for the dead. The first we believe to be a Fable, and to have no ground, either in Scripture or Antiquity. The second our Church doth not condemn, only hath prudently omitted it in the publick Service, because it is a thing dubious in it self, and not approved by Scripture. The use of it in the Ancient Church, doth not in the least prove the belief of *Purgatory*. For they anciently prayed for all Saints departed whatsoever, even for the blessed Virgin, Apostles, Martyrs and Confessors; and their Prayers respected not alleviation of freedom from any internal Punishment, but only the day of Judgment, that God would hasten it; and when that comes, receive all departed Souls into the beatifical Vision, which they generally believed was

not bestowed to the departed Saints till the day of Judgment. That Purgatory was anciently believed, our Author's Testimonies do in no wise prove. Some of them indeed mention a purging Fire; But that Fire was not to exist till the Day of Judgment, when all Souls were to pass through it, and to continue a shorter or longer time in it, according to their greater or lesser Purity. No intermediate punishment between Death and Judgment was believed, besides the delay of Resurrection; if that can properly be called a punishment.

There remains only to consider our Author's Catalogue of general Councils: Wherein he hath committed many gross, and, as I fear, wilful mistakes. He makes Pope *Sylvester* preside over the Council of *Nice*; but *Ensebins* and *Socrates*, whom he citeth, say no such thing. *Baronius* indeed saith it: but all the World knows the contrary. For *Hosius* Bishop of *Corduba* presided, and subscribed in his own name before the Legates of Pope *Sylvester*. That *Damasus* presided over the first Council of *Constantinople*, is so egregiously false; that that Council was both begun and ended without so much as the knowledge of the Pope, or any other Western Bishops. That *Cyril* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, not Pope *Celestin*, presided over the Council of *Ephesus*, is manifest from the Acts of that Council, from the Commission given to him by the Emperor for that purpose, and from all the Historians of those times. *Cyril* indeed acted for Pope *Celestin*, but not as president, but as one Fellow-Bishop manageth the Proxy of another here in *England*, in the House of Lords. In the Council of *Chalcedon* Pope *Leo's* Legates were so far from presiding, that all the Canons of the Council were made in their absence, and not only without, but against their consent. For when the Legates in the next Session protested against the Canons, they were over-ruled by the Council, and forced



forced to submit. That Pope *Vigilius* presided over the Fifth General Council, or Second of *Constantinople*, is so impudent a Falshood, that it might with equal reason be pretended that *Luther* or *Calvin* presided over the Council of *Trent*: For *Vigilius* who was then at *Constantinople*, gathered an opposite Convention of *Western* Bishops, wherein publishing a long Constitution or Decree in favour of the *Tria Capitula*, he concludes with a severe Censure and Condemnation of all who should hereafter Write, Teach, or Propose any thing contrary to his Decree, which he knew was then in doing in the General Council. The Popes Constitution was read in the Council, and notwithstanding it was Decreed, *Can.* 12, 13, 14. That whosoever defended the *Tria Capitula*, or even did not Anathematize them, should be himself Anathematiz'd. After the Conclusion of the Council, and not till then, *Vigilius* submitted, and writing an Epistle to *Eutychius* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, who had presided over the Council, professeth he was now very sorry that by the instigation of the Devil he had dissented from the Council, and in contempt of brotherly Charity had openly disagreed from them, and contended with them; that now he was convinced of his Errors, and therefore retracting his former actions, ratified and submitted to the Decrees of the Council. In the Seventh General Council our Author reckoning up the Hereticks condemned by it, as *Paulus*, *Sergius*, *Cyrus*, *Theodosius*, comes off with an &c. the meaning of which may easily be discovered; for this &c. was invented to save the reputation of Pope *Honorius*, who together with the rest was Anathematized by the Council as a notorious and pestilent Heretick. The Second Council of *Nice* was formerly denied to be General by *Theodorus Studites*, altho a great Patron of Image-Worship; and was condemned in the same age by the great Council of *Francfort*. The Fourth Council of

*Constantinople* in the Year 869 was ever accounted a Schismatical Conventicle by the *Greek Church*. All the following Councils were confined to the *West*, and wanted both the Presence and Suffrage of the *Eastern Patriarchs*, and consequently were not Oecumenical: Many of them are not at this day universally received in the Church of *Rome*; and others are rejected and condemned by the *Gallican Church*, as the First Second, Third, and Fourth of *Lateran*, First, and Second of *Lions*, as to the Constitutions and Canons injurious to the Civil Right of Princes: The Councils of *Florence*, and Fifth of *Lateran*, are wholly rejected by her, and the Council of *Trent* but in part received: Our Author pretendeth, that in the Council of *Florence* the *Greeks* were united to the Church of *Rome*, and subscribed the Union. If a forced compliance of a few Bishops compelled by the threats and force of their Emperor can be call'd an union, this was indeed one: But many of them subscribed for fear of Death, and most for fear of starving, as *Sylvester Sguropulus* an Eye-witness assureth us; and all of them when returning home, were so detested and hated by their Country-men, that they were esteemed worse than Infidels, and not permitted to be buried in holy Ground.

I might make some farther Observations upon our Authors Paper, as why he left that of *Constance* out of the number of *General Councils*; and yet afterwards produced its Authority; how disagreeing the forms of Recantation, prescribed to *Berengarius*, are to the present Belief of the Church of *Rome*, and how little the Testimonies produced by him in favour of Apostolical Traditions, concern the *Romish Doctrine* of Traditions. But what I have already said, is enough to shew that there is a Generation of men in the World, who adding a profound Ignorance to a false Zeal, fear not to sacrifice all considerations of Shame and Honesty, of Truth and Reason, to a present Interest, and the poor advantage of a short-liv'd Imposture.



*Books lately Printed for Richard Chifwell.*

**A** Dissertation concerning the Government of the *Ancient Church*; more particularly of the Encroachments of the *Bishops of Rome* upon other Sees, By *WILLIAM CAVE*, D. D. 8vo.

An Answer to Mr. *Serjeant's* [Sure Footing in Christianity] concerning the Rule of Faith: With some other Discourses. By *WILLIAM FALKNER*, D. D. 4o.

A Vindication of the Ordinations of the *Church of England*; in Answer to a Paper written by one of the *Church of Rome*, to prove the Nullity of our Orders. By *GILBERT BURNET*, D. D. 8vo.

An Abridgment of the History of the Reformation of the *Church of England*. By *GILBERT BURNET*, D. D. 8vo.

The APOLOGY of the *Church of England*; and an Epistle to one Signior *Scipio*, a *Venetian Gentleman*, concerning the Council of *Trent*. Written both in Latin, by the Right Reverend Father in God, *JOHN JEWELL* Lord Bishop of *Salisbury*; Made English by a Person of Quality. To which is added, The Life of the said Bishop; Collected and written by the same Hand, 8vo.

The Life of *WILLIAM BEDEL*, D. D. Bishop of *Kilmore in Ireland*. Together with *Certain Letters* which passed betwixt him and *James Wedderburn* (a late Pensioner of the Holy Inquisition of *Sevil*) in Matter of Religion, concerning the General Motives to the *Roman Obedience*. 8vo.

The Decree made at *ROME* the Second of *March*, 1679. condemning some Opinions of the *Jesuits*, and other *Casuits*. 4o.

A Discourse concerning the Necessity of Reformation, with respect to the Errors and Corruptions of the *Church of Rome*. 4o. First and Second Parts.

A Discourse concerning the Celebration of Divine Service in an Unknown Tongue. 4o.

A Papist not Misrepresented by Protestants. Being a Reply to the Reflections upon the Answer to [A Papist Misrepresented and Represented] 4o.

An Exposition of the Doctrine of the *Church of England*, in the several Articles proposed by the late BISHOP of *CONDOM*, [in his Exposition of the Doctrine of the *Catholic Church*] 4o.

A Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the *Church of England*; against the Exceptions of *Monf. de Meaux*, late Bishop of *Condom*, and his Vindicator. 4o.

A CATECHISM explaining the Doctrine and Practices of the *Church of Rome*. With an Answer thereunto. By a Protestant of the *Church of England* 8vo.

A Papist Represented and not Misrepresented, being an Answer to the First, Second, Fifth and Sixth Sheets of the Second Part of the [Papist Misrepresented and Represented]; and for a further Vindication of the CATECHISM, truly representing the Doctrines and Practices of the *Church of Rome*. 4o.

The Lay Christian's Obligation to read the Holy Scriptures. 4o.

The Plain Man's Reply to the *Catholic Missionaries*. 24o.

An Answer to THREE PAPERS lately printed, concerning the Authority of the *Catholic Church* in Matters of Faith, and the Reformation of the *Church of England*. 4o.

A Vindication of the Answer to THREE PAPERS concerning the Unity and Authority of the *Catholic Church*, and the Reformation of the *Church of England*. 4o. Mr.

## B O O K S lately Printed for Richard Chiswell.

Mr. *Chillingworth's* Book, called [ *The Religion of Protestants a safe way to Salvation* ] made more generally useful by omitting Personal Contests, but inserting whatsoever concerns the common Cause of *Protestants*, or defends the *Church of England*, with an exact Table of Contents; and an Addition of some genuine Pieces of Mr. *Chillingworth's* never before printed, viz. against the *Infallibility* of the *Roman Church*, *Transubstantiation*, *Tradition*, &c. And an Account of what moved the Author to turn Papist, with his Confutation of the said *Motives*.

The Pillar and Ground of Truth. A Treatise shewing that the *Roman Church* falsely claims to be *That Church*, and the Pillar of *That Truth*, mentioned by *S. Paul* in his first Epistle to *Timothy*, Chap. 3. Vers<sup>15</sup>. 4to.

The Peoples Right to read the Holy Scripture Asserted. 4to.

A Short Summary of the principal Controversies between the Church of *England* and the Church of *Rome*; being a Vindication of several Protestant Doctrines, in Answer to a Late Pamphlet, Intituled, [ *Protestancy destitute of Scripture Proofs*. ] 4to.

Two Discourses; Of Purgatory, and Prayers for the Dead.

An Answer to a Late Pamphlet, Intituled, [ *The Judgment and Doctrine of the Clergy of the Church of England concerning one Special Branch of the King's Prerogative, viz. In dispensing with the Penal Laws*. ] 4to.

The Notes of the Church, as laid down by Cardinal *Bellarmin*, examined and confuted. 4to.

Preparation for Death: Being a Letter sent to a young Gentlewoman in *France*, in a dangerous Distemper of which she died.

The Difference between the Church of *England* and the Church of *Rome*, in opposition to a late Book, Intituled, *An Agreement between the Church of England and Church of Rome*.

A PRIVATE PRATER to be used in Difficult Times.

A True Account of a Conference held about Religion at *London*, Sept. 29. 1687. between *A. Pulson*, Jesuit, and *The. Tenison*, D. D. as also of that which led to it, and followed after it. 4to.

The Vindication of *A. Cressener*, Schoolmaster in *Long-Acre*, from the Aspersions of *A. Pulson*, Jesuit, Schoolmaster in the *Savoy*, together with some Account of his Discourse with Mr. *Meredith*.

A Discourse shewing that Protestants are on the safer Side, notwithstanding the uncharitable Judgment of their Adversaries; and that Their Religion is the surest Way to Heaven. 4to.

Six Conferences concerning the *Eucharist*. wherein is shewed, that the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* overthrows the Proofs of Christian Religion.

A Discourse concerning the Pretended Sacrament of *Extreme Unction*, with an Account of the occasions and beginnings of it in the *Western Church*. In three Parts; With a Letter to the Vindicator of the Bishop of *Condom*.

*Books lately Printed for Richard Chiswell.*

The Pamphlet entituled, *Speculum Ecclesiasticum*, or an Ecclesiastical Prospective-Glass, considered, in its False Reasonings and Quotations. There are added, by way of Preface, two further Answers, the First, to the Defender of the *Speculum*; the Second to the Half-sheet against the *Six Conferences*.

---

*In the Press.*

A *Second Defence* of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England, against the new Exceptions of *Mons. de Meaux*, late Bishop of Condom, and his Vindicator. The FIRST PART, in which the Account that has been given of the Bishop of *Meaux's* Exposition, is fully Vindicated; the Distinction of Old and New Popery *Historically* asserted, and the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, in Point of *Image-worship*, more particularly considered. 4<sup>o</sup>.

The Incurable Scepticism of the Church of *Rome*. By the Author of the [*Six Conferences concerning the Eucharist.*] 4<sup>o</sup>.